

m10 12/1
RECEIVED

DEC 01 2008

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
RAMONA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP**

San Diego County
DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND USE

A regular meeting of the Ramona Community Planning Group (RCPG) was held November 6, 2008, at 7 p.m., at the Ramona Community Center, 434 Aqua Lane, Ramona, California.

In Attendance:	Chad Anderson	Chris Anderson	Torry Brean
	Matt Deskovick	Carolyn Dorroh	Katherine L. Finley
	Kathy S. Finley	Dennis Grimes	Kristi Mansolf
	Vivian Osborn	Helene Radzik	Luauna Stines
	Dennis Sprong	Angus Tobiason	

Absent: Andrew Simmons

Helene Radzik, Chair of the RCPG, acted as Chair of the meeting. Kristi Mansolf, Secretary of the RCPG, acted as Secretary of the meeting.

- ITEM 1: The Chair Called the Meeting to Order at 7:10 p.m.**
- ITEM 2: Pledge of Allegiance**
- ITEM 3: The Secretary Determined a Quorum was Present**
- ITEM 4: LIST OF ABSENTEES FOR THIS MEETING. Determination of Excused and Unexcused Absences by the RCPG – Secretary Will Read Record Separately from the Minutes – Andrew Simmons had an excused absence.**
- ITEM 5: Approval of Order of the Agenda (Action)**

The order of the agenda was approved 14-0-0-0-1, with no objections, and with Andrew Simmons absent.

- ITEM 6: Roberts Rules of Order – Rules of Parliamentary Procedure to be Followed during Meeting. The Brown Act – General Information on What it is and How it Applies to the RCPG (Chair)**

The Chair said Roberts Rules of Order govern how the RCPG meetings are conducted. The Brown Act defines how the public participates in the meeting.

- ITEM 7: ANNOUNCEMENTS & Correspondence Received (Chair)**

The Chair announced that speakers would each have 3 minutes. The length of presentations and speakers for any given item should not exceed 1 hour. For the Target project, the RCPG has no purview as the project has not been filed. There will be no vote.

- ITEM 8: APPROVAL OF MINUTES 10-2-08 (Action)**

The minutes of the meeting October 2, 2008, were approved 11-0-3-0-1, with no objections, with Chris Anderson, Carolyn Dorroh and Katherine L. Finley abstaining, and Andrew Simmons absent.

**ITEM 9: NON-AGENDA ITEMS Presentations on Land Issues not on Current Agenda
(No Presentations on Ongoing Projects – These Must be Agendized)**

Speaker: Luauna Stines, Ramona Resident

Ms. Stines said a prayer.

Speaker: Juanita Hayes, Public Affairs Office of SDG&E

Ms. Hayes wanted to give the community an update of where SDG&E was at with their fire prevention program. SDG&E has suspended, until next year, their fire prevention program where they turn off the power over large areas of the County during major wind events. They have been replacing wood poles with steel poles. Heavier lines are being strung (the lower lines are telecommunications lines). They regularly inspect the 400,000 trees in their inventory. Several entities still do not have back up generators in place if SDG&E implements their fire prevention plan to shut off the power. SDG&E is working with the School Districts and the Water Districts. There will be community information meetings in other rural areas of the County. One is scheduled for Valley Center on November 17. Ms. Hayes handed out an information sheet with her contact information and links and phone numbers for SDG&E related issues. SDG&E wants people to register generators they use. If generators are not installed correctly, they can backfeed into the system, causing major problems. SDG&E is trying to track down all people on medical equipment. In a potential blackout, SDG&E will pick up these people and take them to a medical facility. So far, only 100,000 people have registered their cell phones for reverse 911 calls. Ms. Hayes will be back to update us in the future.

The Chair asked the unofficial, new RCPG members elect to please stand and be recognized.

ITEM 10: NEW BUSINESS

**(a) Proposal for a Target Store on Hwy 67, on the North side of Hwy 67
across from Rancho Maria Ln., in Ramona by Lauth Retail. Presentation of
Preliminary Site Plan (Presentation Only)**

Larry Gilleland, of Vertical Partners – representing Target – presented the proposal. He said Target is very early in the process and they wanted to come and garner support for the proposal. Vertical Partners is the entity that will be developing the shopping center. He will come back with elevation lines and specifics for the project in the future. They will work on access – getting people into and out of the project.

Ramona residents go “down the hill” regularly for goods and services. It is good to create a self-sustaining community. This project is a business opportunity for Ramona residents to open franchises for entrepreneurs. The proposal will maintain real estate values in the area. It will add to property values due to being an added convenience. The project becomes more economical as cost to get goods is reduced. When Ramona becomes a city, the retention of future sales tax revenues will be used in Ramona. Jobs will be created. They will make improvements to adjacent arteries. The developer intends to mitigate traffic and other issues. Architecture is planned that will blend with the rural charm of Ramona. There will be preservation of future open space with a park area. With the shopping center, the carbon footprint will be reduced, which will help with environmental impacts. They will redevelop the entry way to Ramona, creating a more positive image.

Mr. Gilleland discussed the issues associated with development. Through considerate architectural design they will create a project that blends with the existing community character. Landscape planning will be done to minimize the effects of an asphalt jungle. They will be adding 2 stop lights at the 2 access points to the shopping center to help traffic. For tenants – several department stores are interested in coming to the area. Target has had Ramona on their radar screen for some time. There will be restaurants where people can sit down to dine, banks, gas/convenience stores, and sporting goods.

The site being considered is just north of Susie Way off Hwy 67. It is 53 acres. It was a chicken farm. They will have to file a rezone and an amendment to the San Diego County General Plan to accomplish the project.

Next they will be including amenities and design elements taken from community input. Vertical Partners plans to work closely with Ramona to create a project that can be supported by the town and its residents. He will be meeting with other community groups in Ramona to gain support. He also wants the County to support the project.

The Chair asked for comments from the RCPG.

Mr. Deskovick doesn't want to see commercial development on this side of Ramona, which is well out of the commercial area. We have denied other requests to go out of town past Etcheverry St. Etcheverry St. is where the sewer ends. He doesn't want to see our farmland taken for commercial development.

Ms. Dorroh said the SA 330 could go right through Mr. Gilleland's project. She is opposed to signal lights in this area being so close to Dye Rd. There were concerns about the signal light from the SA 330 being so close to the signal lights at Highland Valley Rd. when it was originally proposed. This project will add 2 more signals in the immediate area. When K-Mart came in, nurseries and Woodwards went out of business. K-Mart targeted businesses to put out of business. Employees at K-Mart can't answer questions on plants and landscaping. She asked if a study has been done to see who will be put out of business if this project is built? Are they targeting any businesses to put them out of business? A lot of services are available to people on their way home from work, so they don't shop for these items in Ramona.

Mr. Tobiason asked if Target would have to pay TIF fees? Would they have to pay for improvements to the State Highway? What about water?

Mr. Gilleland said that there are significant traffic impact fees for a project such as this.

Mr. Grimes asked if there would be banks in the shopping center, and what type of retail businesses do they think they will attract?

Mr. Gilleland said the answer lies in tenant interest. They deal with large businesses.

Mr. Grimes asked if there would be office space and housing included with the project, such as mixed use development?

Mr. Gilleland said that the shopping center would be strictly retail. Mixed use doesn't work everywhere.

The Chair said that we are in a GP Update now. She understands that there will be no more general plan amendments. Has Mr. Gilleland looked into this? Also, is the property in escrow? The sewer does not extend out to the proposed project site. The Chair said she heard Target has had a 4 percent decline in sales this year.

Mr. Gilleland said he will look into the GP Update status for general plan amendments. Right now they want to know if there is community support. They work through contracts to purchase. Nothing has been purchased yet. The site was picked due to size and location. Low density housing is proposed for the GP Update for this site.

Ms. Kathy S. Finley asked how many tenants are expected?

Mr. Gilleland said there could be 20 tenants.

Ms. Osborn asked where Mr. Gilleland's company is located?

Mr. Gilleland said his office is in Denver. The company is based in Indiana.

Ms. Osborn suggested Mr. Gilleland talk to the RMWD. The corner property on Highland Valley Rd. and Hwy 67 doesn't perc and so the church proposed for the site can't be built without sewer. There are no plans to extend the sewer. There is a dark sky policy that needs to be adhered to, as we are in the impact area for the Palomar observatory.

Mr. Gilleland said that lumen studies will be done.

Mr. Brean said that he doesn't like the idea of fractured commercial so close to town. Traffic backs up at the signal lights on Hwy 67 now going out of town. The addition of 2 more signals will make this work. If the project is pursued, it will impact the overall economy of the community. He doesn't know how K-Mart will stay in business.

Mr. Sprong asked if other commercial properties have been considered?

Mr. Gilleland said there is land by the airport that is commercial. They want to get some benefit from being on the main highway. The airport is too far off the main road. Mr. Gilleland said he has entered into agreements with the landowners for the property being considered. This site has enough critical mass for people who want to be tenants. There has to be anchor tenants in the shopping center. He may consider pedestrian and/or equestrian connections to accommodate people living in the area.

Ms. Anderson said that the property is to be low density residential in the GP Update, but the zoning overlay has not been done yet. Currently it is zoned for 1 d.u. per 10 acres. For the 2000/2002 map for the GP Update, it is also zoned the same. The environmentally superior map of the GP Update shows it as 1 d.u. per 10 acres and 1 d.u. per 20 acres. The hybrid map of the GP Update shows it as 1 d.u. per 10 acres. She hopes Target finds a place in the community.

Mr. Gilleland said it takes about 2 years to get through the process for a project like this.

Ms. Anderson said that there are lots on Hwy 67 that can't be built because of side friction. Cal Trans won't allow it. This site is outside of the commercial area and out of the Ramona Village Design area. The look of the project, lighting and colors will have to be determined. Sewer will

have to be considered. There is no sewer capacity for the growth proposed now in the community. The Community Plan is against package treatment plants. This is also the County position.

Ms. Stines said a Target store in the middle of the Town Center is not feasible. People can't get around town as it is. Ramona will grow. We need jobs in Ramona for teens. The Cumming Ranch project will bring sewer to the location. This shopping center will bring restaurants.

Ms. Dorroh said that the site is in a restricted building area due to its proximity to the Ramona Airport.

Mr. Grimes said that there were 23 people registering support for the project. A petition was turned in with 85 signatures supporting the project.

Speaker: Liz Massey, Ramona Resident

Ms. Massey said that we need choices. K-Mart is fine. K-Mart came aboard and we still went to the existing stores. Target has good buyers. If we all work together, we can find a place for Target in the community. Target will make our property values go up. We have retirees in town and families who need Target so they don't have to go "down the hill".

Speaker: Doug Oliver, Ramona Business Owner

Mr. Oliver is a local business owner. He sees a lot of vacancies in Ramona. Target will take business away from downtown Ramona. K-Mart center never is filled with tenants – there are always vacancies. What percentage of Target's products are from this country? He believes this business should be in downtown Ramona.

ITEM 11: SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

11-A: TRANSPORTATION/TRAILS/CUDA (Simmons) (Action Items)

11-A-1: Status Update from the County on Ramona St. Extension Project, Boundary to Warnock. (Discussion and Possible Action to Amend Something Previously Adopted)

Ed Zielanski from the Capital Improvement Projects section of DPW attended the meeting, with Kathleen Hider from the Real Estate Division. Mr. Zielanski gave a status update of the Ramona St. Extension project.

The project will construct a road segment that will extend Ramona St. from Boundary to Warnock. This is a Transportation Impact Fee eligible project. The project was submitted in July 2005 by the RCPG as a priority project. The project has been designed using the best design criteria for the code and standards. The road will include 2, 12 foot travel lanes, an 8 foot park lane with a 12 foot parkway on the other side of the road. Shoulder parking will be eliminated.

Since 1890, 30 feet of right of way has been on the map for Ramona St. The County has the deed for the road easement. There was an Irrevocable Offer of Dedication (IOD) for additional property from the land owners.

Mr. Zielanski asked for the RCPG support. This project is number 6 out of the top 10 for Ramona. In 2006, the County determined that the project was viable. Environmental review and a mitigated negative declaration were prepared in fall/winter of 2007. As far as environmental issues, air

quality doesn't conflict with the project. The project is not subject to air streaming. There is no traffic now, and it is hard to determine future traffic projections. Current projections are for 8,000 ADT's.

The traffic pattern is not detrimental to the level of service (LOS). The LOS is not expected to increase. The project will relieve the traffic on San Vicente Rd. and help to relieve congestion on Hwy 67, San Vicente to Warnock. As far as noise -- noise levels will not exceed Ramona's restrictive 55 noise decibal level during operation.

There are no special habitats for biological resources on site. Archaeology sites will be monitored for during construction.

There are elevation changes that have to tie into the existing elevations. The speed limit will be 40 mph. Mr. Zielanski will be consulting with the Traffic Advisory Committee to determine the best speed for the road. Then the road can be reviewed in the future and adjustments made as needed. The residents traffic safety will be considered. There have been 16 single vehicle collisions in 5 years that have been reported. There will be a stop sign for making the turn to Warnock. Fences, corrals and wells that are in the right of way will be negotiated with the property owners. In the right of way phase, these types of considerations are evaluated and included in the cost of the right of way.

As far as utilities, the City of San Diego has an aquaduct that goes under the proposed road alignment. The RMWD has lines in the area. The County will be upgrading these lines and fitting them. The aquaduct is cost prohibitive to move. The City of San Diego can't afford to move it for at least 3 years.

Speaker: Carmen La Belle, Ramona Resident

Ms. La Belle turned in a legal description of her property for the record. Ms. La Belle asked for the legal description of the 60 foot IOD to build the road segment. She needs a copy of the document that describes the right of way, with metes and bounds, and the full legal description of its location as it relates to her property. Ms. LaBelle said that her Preliminary Title Report gives no information on the 60 foot road. The road will impact her yard. She is concerned about living under a roller coaster. The pollution from the cars will go into her house. Ms. La Belle feels her property value will decrease. Access is another consideration. They have horses and a trailer and need access to the road at more than one point. She wants to see the document showing that the County has access rights.

The Chair said that this information can be researched at the County Recorder.

Mr. Zielanski said the IOD is on the western side of Ms. La Belle's property. There will be a retaining wall to mitigate the excessive slope. Ms. La Belle's house pad is lower than the existing ground.

Speaker: Darrell Beck, Ramona Resident

Mr. Beck said that Ramona needs east and west roads -- this was determined 15 to 18 years ago. Mr. Beck has served on the RCPG. An effort was made to improve Dye Rd. and the work was not finished. The road would take people out of the SDCE to Dye Rd. San Vicente/10th St. was improved to Main. Mr. Beck hasn't seen a road built in awhile. Ramona St. will bring traffic to

Main. Mr. Beck understands that there will be a 12 foot elevation change. He asked if there wasn't a better way to build a road? He requested the County work on east/west roads in Ramona.

Speaker: Doug Oliver, Ramona Resident

Mr. Oliver said the Boundary school site has increased traffic substantially. If the Ramona St. Extension is punched through, there will be more problems. The end result will be putting a major thoroughfare where one doesn't belong.

Speaker: Jerry Myers, Ramona Resident

Mr. Myers said there have been 21 accidents at the corner of Warnock and Ramona St. He is concerned about his quality of life. The improvements proposed will block the westerly breeze and he will no longer be able to see the sunset. There will also be an increase in noise. His acreage will be decreased. He will lose 30 trees. The end of the slope will be 15 feet from his house. He conducts agriculture on his site – this land is in ag preserve. He doesn't want to lose his fences. (Mr. Myers circulated photos of his property.)

Speaker: Michelle Mixon, Ramona Resident

Ms. Mixon lives next to the Myers. She would prefer the road doesn't go through. The current plan is preferred due to the aquaduct. She understands the City can move the aquaduct in 3 years at their expense – why not wait?

Speaker: Donna Myers, Ramona Resident

Ms. Myers said the City has failed to move their 36 inch aquaduct. Her concerns are the hazards from the road, noise, fire safety and access, and air quality. This is a dangerous corner – there is about 1 accident per month. The road will be 12 feet high over her house. The road will be within 15 feet of her house. There is a home with fragile children nearby. Ms. Myers grows organic crops. Across the road there is a farm with pigs where medical research is conducted. Her property is a working ranch. She feels there was inaccurate information presented to the RCPG in March of 2008 when the project was presented.

Speaker: William Buck, Ramona Resident

Mr. Buck said that the proposed slope will be 10.39 percent when the road is built. The City of San Diego is dictating to the County how high the road will be due to the 36 inch aquaduct. He spoke to someone at the City of San Diego, and they didn't know about the proposed road improvement. For comparison, Slaughterhouse Rd. to Hwy 67 is a 7 percent slope. There are 4 schools in this area generating a lot of traffic. The speed limit will be 45 mph.

Speaker: Susan Paul, Ramona Resident

Ms. Paul is concerned with safety. Now neighbors can look out on each others properties and look out for each other. With the road built, they won't be able to look out for each other as they won't be able to see the other properties. Her well is her only source of water. The road will impact her well. Air quality, traffic and lights are other concerns. She is against the road design. She thinks they should lower the road before they built it.

Speaker: Sandra Tibbs, Ramona Resident

Ms. Tibbs is concerned with air quality impacts from the road. Silt gets into her eaves from the highway traffic. She believes Dye Rd. should be fixed instead.

Speaker: Susan Buck, Ramona Resident

Ms. Buck said this area of Ramona is in ag preserve. They can have 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres. The "O" animal designator is on the properties. She has a kennel business and raises animals. In the environmental document, impacts to businesses like her kennel business and family farm are not addressed.

Speaker: Tammie Gilbert, Ramona Resident

Ms. Gilbert said there is 1 car every 10 seconds, average, on Ramona St. She requests a 25 mph speed limit on Ramona St. Instead of a sidewalk, she feels horse trails should be put in.

Speaker: Linda Wright, Ramona Resident

Ms. Wright is a neighbor. She is across from the dairy/ag area. Air quality issues from the road being built will affect the animals. The proposed height of the road and the increase in traffic will also affect the animals. She feels the design is flawed.

Speaker: Ken Brennecke, Ramona Resident

Mr. Brennecke said he feels the biggest issue is encroachment. He wants to create a botanical garden on his property and so wants no encroachment. He felt an EIR should have been done for the environmental review for the road. There was a lack of information for the area residents as far as reports went. He has 3 gates on the eastern part of his property. Mr. Brennecke handed in a letter outlining his concerns.

Speaker: Cathy Jackson, Ramona Resident

Ms. Jackson is not in the affected area. She has a 2 story house with decks. She can hear traffic all day and night. There is a lot of foot traffic. When school lets out, there are a lot of children present. She is ½ block from RCS. She is worried about the road becoming a thoroughfare. There should be a reduced speed to 25 mph due to the dip in the road. All of the dust from the road gets everywhere.

Two members of the public filled out speaker slips who were in favor of the project but did not wish to speak.

Mr. Zielanski said there are many issues affecting individual properties that will be addressed in the real property/acquisition phase of the project. Slopes can be negotiated, trees identified and wells protected. There will be a meeting in early December with Supervisor Jacob on this issue that will include the residents.

The County has 90 percent of the right of way needed to build the project. Residents were notified during the environmental review portion of the project which ended April 3, 2008. He has spoken to 3 out of 5 residents, which includes many present at the meeting. The project was designed to CEQA requirements. The proper studies have been completed. The road improvement is not a destination project. The issues that have been brought up will be addressed. The road will be 24

feet wide with an approximately 5 foot bike lane on either side. DG will be along the roads rather than sidewalks. The road is a connecting element. Regarding the City aqueduct – the City is not dictating the alignment. The vertical alignment was looked at. A 10 degree vertical curve was needed. The grade is existing now. Sustained steep grade is a problem – such as Hwy 67 to Slaughterhouse Canyon. There will be impacts to side properties. There has to be a retaining wall. A cross section was presented in March. Coordination will come later with offers for the right of way.

Why is this project first? In the 2003 Road Master Plan, this project was identified as a priority. Fifty percent of the road alignment is there in a lot of areas. The County has 60 feet of right of way. Ramona will get an important element road. If there was no right of way, the County would have engaged property owners sooner.

The Chair said that at the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee meeting, there was not so much an issue of the road improvement but of the road engineering.

Ms. Stines said that we need roads, but she is worried about the impacts to the property owners with this road.

Mr. Deskovick said he looked at the road. People are opposed to the elevations.

Mr. Zielanski said that fill will not be added to the peak.

Mr. Deskovick thinks the road needs to be there. It has been discussed over the years. The fill slopes are not so massive.

Mr. Zielanski said fill is required. The current project design will make a safe road according to vertical standards.

Mr. Deskovick said he will be a liaison between the residents and the County.

When asked if the County had slope easements, Mr. Zielanski said they did not.

Ms. Dorroh asked whether the County had written permission to stake the property?

Ms. Hider said there is a procedure that is followed when staking property.

Ms. Dorroh said that CEQA says to address the worse case scenario. The environmental document traffic projections seem low.

Mr. Zielanski said the project as designed meets the regional air quality standards.

Ms. Dorroh said that regarding CEQA, the environmental document says there is no impact to vistas.

Ms. Zielanski said scenic vistas in this context refers to a highway, not a personal view.

Ms. Dorroh asked if the affected well will be relocated? Is the well in the setback requirement area? There will be no room to turn around in the driveway.

Mr. Zielanski said he doesn't think there has to be a turn around in a driveway.

Mr. Tobiason asked about fill?

Mr. Zielanski said there will be 6 feet of fill on the Myers property.

Ms. Kathy S. Finley said the road will redirect traffic and move around people, allowing them to access the 3 schools more easily. The road won't be a thoroughfare. It will help the local people to circulate.

Ms. Osborn said the Planning Commission said for the School District should not have put the school on Boundary Ave. There should be coordination between all districts on such projects.

Ms. Katherine L. Finley asked why the road was not built in the last 40 years?

Mr. Zielanski said the road was not a priority project. The County had the first half of the right of way in 1890 and the second half in 1978.

Ms. Katherine L. Finley wanted to make a motion that we predicate the City of San Diego to deepen the aquaduct. The aquaduct bleeds off water from Sutherland to the San Vicente Reservoir.

The Chair said that we must first amend something previously adopted before we can take further action on this project.

Ms. Mansolf read the motion from March, 2008, on the project: "To accept the road improvements as presented and urge timely completion of that effort."

MOTION: TO AMEND SOMETHING PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED.

(Discussion on the motion)

Mr. Brean is concerned that the road project will go away and not get built. Ramona needs roads and this connection will improve circulation in the town.

Ms. Katherine L. Finley said that there has been litigation regarding the Boundary School site. There is a lot of traffic from the school. The school was badly planned.

(Voting on the motion)

Upon motion made by Vivian Osborn and seconded by Carolyn Dorroh, the Motion was **withdrawn**.

Mr. Brean said that where roads get built, people get upset.

Mr. Deskovick said he will work to set up a meeting with the homeowners.

**11-A-2:TPM 21141 Leins TPM, 620 Haverford Rd. Subdivide a 19 Acre
Parcel into 4 Parcels. Scenic Designator Applies. To be 1300 feet
From Pine St. (w/WEST)**

Ms. Mansolf gave the West Subcommittee report. Norm Kirk had presented the project. The project is on land that is General Plan Designation Ag 19. The Leins have owned the property since

1968. There is an existing home on site and an existing outbuilding. The owners of the Christmas trees on site have been leasing the property. There is a 4 acre minimum lot size on the property. He met with the Design Review Board last month. He wasn't sure why this was necessary as he is over the 1,000 foot limit for being off the scenic highway. Twenty property owners have been notified of the permit application. There was a site distance issue on Haverford which is being rectified by putting the access in the location as shown on the map. One possible goal is for the Christmas tree owner to buy the land. It is proposed for the project to be hooked up to the RMWD. Wells are shown on the project map. The project will be on septic. The West Subcommittee approved the project.

The Transportation/Trails Subcommittee had also supported the project.

MOTION: TO APPROVE.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Vivian Osborn, the Motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Andrew Simmons absent.

**11-A-3:TPM 20990RPL, 1521 Walnut St. (Between Alice St. and Brazos), 4 Lot
Subdivision on 4.22 Acres. RBF Consulting, Engineer; Turnkey Homes,
Developer (CUDA/T&T)**

The applicant did not show up at the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee meeting and was not at the RCPG meeting. Although the RCPG approved this project in the past, it has been reconfigured. The project planner has not gotten back to the Secretary on this to verify that the changes are not significant enough to warrant another review.

MOTION: TO TABLE UNTIL NEXT MONTH.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Luauna Stines, the Motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Andrew Simmons absent.

**11-A-4:Parks Department Update on Plans for the Oak Country II Staging Area and
Trails Plan**

The Chair said that the Parks Department gave an update on plans for the Oak Country II Staging Area and Trails Plan - Mike McFedries, who is the open space manager for this area, took some of the T&T members on a tour of the Oak Country Staging Area. It will open sometime around summer of 2009, in an area across from Mount Woodson school for hiking and horse trailers. Basically, the trails in the Oak Country will be the ranch roads, non-motorized elements only on the trails.

**11-A-5:Department of Public Works County Public Road Standards, Review of
Draft Revisions –Comments due 11-14-08 (Discussion and Possible Action)
(Taken out of Order – Addressed under 11-E-4)**

11-A-6:GP Update – Consideration of Trails and Circulation – Not Addressed

11-A-7:Consideration of Draft Cell Site Standards – (continued to December)

**11-A-8:Establishment of Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Square Foot Limit for Big
Box Retail (CUDA – continued to December)**

11-B: WEST/EAST (Mansolf) (Action Items)

11-B-1:TPM 21141 Leins TPM, 620 Haverford Rd. Subdivide a 19 Acre Parcel into 4 Parcels. Scenic Designator Applies. To be 1300 feet From Pine St. (w/T&T)

11-B-2:ZAP 02-029w1, 16850 Old Survey Rd., 10.08 Acres. Verizon Wireless Emergency Generator to Existing Wireless Telecom Facility. 3 feet, 2 inches wide by 7 feet 11 inches long by 59 inches Tall. To be Powered by Diesel Auxiliary

The applicant was not in attendance at the RCPG meeting, nor had he come to the West Subcommittee meeting.

MOTION: TO TABLE UNTIL NEXT MONTH.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Vivian Osborn, the Motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Andrew Simmons absent.

11-B-3:AD08-048, Administrative Permit to Place an 8 Foot Fence Along 1/8th of the Property Line at 15316 Sky High Rd. Mounier, Owner

Ms. Mansolf said that the Mouniers had just received their Notice of Approval from DPLU for the project fence, so the RCPG did not need to review it.

11-B-4:AD 08-052, 15777 Paseo Penasco. Aardema, Owner. 14.2 Acres. Garage for a Motor Home & 2 Cars for a Total of 956 sq. ft. Existing Barn is 2400, Putting the Project 356 sq. ft. over the Allowance without An Administrative Permit

Ms. Mansolf gave the West Subcommittee report. Mr. Aardema had presented the project. He lost his house during the 2007 fires. His old garage was 600 feet. He wants a garage to put his motor home in. He has a barn that is 2400 square feet. The barn is detached. Detached structures on his property can't exceed 3000 square feet without an administrative permit. The proposed garage will be 950 feet and detached. His property is 14 acres on the top of the mountain. On the map, a setback of 21 feet is shown for the detached garage from the adjoining property line. The RMWD/RFD is saying that 30 feet is required. Mr. Aardema says that the setback will be 30 feet. Neighbors have signed off on the project. Ms. Mansolf brought forward the West Subcommittee motion.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE SQUARE FOOTAGE OVERAGE FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE PERMIT.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Kathy S. Finley, the Motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Andrew Simmons absent.

**11-B-5:POD 08-012, Tiered Winery Zoning Ordinance Amendment. Public Review Ends 11-7-08. Available online at:
http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/ceqa_public_review.html**

The County has sent out the Notice of Preparation of an EIR for Tiered Winery Zoning Ordinance Amendment. This is the opportunity to ask the County to include items not shown in the scope of work to be addressed by the project EIR.

A West Subcommittee member said that he would like to have included in the EIR that if any boutique winery applicant is service by a private road easement, the applicant must have 100 percent property owner approval from each property owner served by that road.

Ms. Dorroh said the regional ordinance needs to address cumulative and regional impacts of wineries.

MOTION: TO SEND COMMENTS.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Vivian Osborn, the Motion **failed 5-9-0-0-1**, with Chad Anderson, Torry Brean, Matt Deskovick, Kathy S. Finley, Dennis Grimes, Helene Radzik, Dennis Sprong, Luauna Stines and Angus Tobiason voting no, and Andrew Simmons absent.

11-C: AHOPE (Osborn) (Action Items)

11-C-1: Review of Draft Conservation Element of the Ramona Community Plan update for the San Diego County General Plan 2020 Update. Sections within the current draft of the CONSERVATION Element to be reviewed, discussed, corrections recommended and additions recommended are: GOAL, FINDINGS, Resource Conservation Areas, Area-Wide Environmental Characteristics, Biological Communities and Habitats, Groundwater, Archaeology, Air quality, Energy and Additional Information.

Ms. Osborn presented the RCPG with the findings of the AHOPE Subcommittee that outlined deficiencies in the current Ramona Community Plan text, and made recommendations to address these deficiencies. The Conservation Element, Open Space Element and 'History' Draft Text were included in the report. Information from the AHOPE meeting, presented to the RCPG, will be funneled into the GP Update Subcommittee for inclusion in the Draft Ramona Community Plan text.

11-C-2: Review of Draft OPEN SPACE Element of the Ramona Community Plan update for the San Diego County General Plan 2020 Update. Sections within the current draft of the OPEN SPACE Element to be reviewed, discussed, corrections recommended and additions recommended are: GOAL, FINDINGS, and POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS. (See 11-C-1 above)

11-C-3: Review Ramona Community Plan 'History' Draft Text. There is a concern that there is an omission of the Historical Ramona's Colonnade Trees. This is new information not previously reviewed by the RCPG 2020 Subcommittee. (See 11-C-1 above)

11-D: PARKS (Brean) (Action)

11-D-1: GP Update – Consideration of Trails and Parks – Not Addressed

11-E: GP Update Plan (Anderson) (Action Items)

11-E-1: Ramona Community Plan Update -- Circulation and Mobility, Conservation

**and Open Space, Safety, Noise, Specific Plans and Special Study Areas.
Consideration of Items Carried Over from 10-2-08 – Not Addressed**

**11-E-2: Consideration and Recommendation on Draft Village Limit Line/Draft
Rural Village Boundary (Carried Over from Special Meeting 6-19-08 and 7-3-
08) – Not Addressed**

**11-E-4: Report on Steering Committee Meeting 10-25-08 (RCPG Chair)
(Taken out of Order)**

The Chair report on the Steering Committee meeting where the Department of Public Works County Public Road Standards, Draft Revisions, were reviewed. Comments on the revisions are due 11-14-08.

The Chair said that on page 49, the document says that someone can request a modification to a road standard, and the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use will have the ability to approve the modification, without Planning and Sponsor Group review. The Chair said she feels there should be an appeal process so that these decisions are not at the whim of the Director, and Planning and Sponsor Groups should be aware that a road modification request has been made. The Director also will have the power to determine that Fire Department requirements are excessive.

MOTION: TO SEND COMMENTS.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Kathy S. Finley, the Motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Andrew Simmons absent.

**11-E-3: Report on Interest Group Meeting 10-27-08 (Subcommittee Chair)
(Taken out of Order)**

Ms. Anderson said, in her report, that the wildlife agencies are pushing back on trails, saying they are becoming too invasive in sensitive areas. Projects are being kicked out by the wildlife agencies due to trail proposals. Trails are having to be removed that were approved.

Conservation Subdivisions were discussed. The ownership of Conservation Subdivisions are being questioned. The County doesn't want the responsibility of maintenance. Dan Silver of the Endangered Habitat League said he is in favor of Conservations Subdivisions, saying they will not impact community character.

Ms. Anderson said the Draft GP Update document will be online November 14. She suggested that possibly in the future an organized presentation be made to the Board of Supervisors (3 people, 5 minutes each) regarding Ramona's community character and way of life.

There was discussion on the North County MSCP. Ms. Anderson said that there is consideration to have both Conservation Subdivisions and MSCP restrictions in the North County MSCP. She feels the North County MSCP is already to include the effects that Conservation Subdivisions are supposed to accomplish. She feels too much is being asked for.

11-F: SOUTH (Stines) (No Business)

11-G: DESIGN REVIEW (Anderson) – Update on Projects Reviewed by the

Design Review Board – Ms. Anderson gave a brief report.

11-H: TOWN CENTER COMMITTEE (Brean/Simmons) Update on Town Center Committee Meetings – Report to RCPG – Not Addressed

12. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (Chair)

A. Concerns From Members – None

B. Names Submitted for New Subcommittee Members (Action) – None

C. Agenda Requests – None

13. ADJOURNMENT – 11:30

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf